

Serial No. 09/886,346  
Amdt. dated March 2, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of December 2, 2004

Attorney Docket No. PF02258NA

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 through 21 remain in this application. Claims 1 and 12 have been amended.

Claims 1, 5 through 12, and 16 through 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US2002/0184089A1 to Tsou, et al. ("Tsou, et al. publication") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,636,872 to Heath, et al. ("Heath, et al. patent"). Claims 2 through 4 and 13 through 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Tsou, et al. publication in view of the Heath, et al. patent and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US2002/0129103A1 to Birkler, et al. ("Birkler, et al. publication").

Claim 1 as amended provides, *inter alia*, "second IM contact data associated with said IM client and transmitted to a wireless device of said IM client during a prior wireless connection" and "wherein said second IM contact data associated with said IM client is updated with said first IM contact data associated with said IM client for subsequent comparison". Claim 12 as amended provides, *inter alia*, "second IM contact data associated with said IM client and transmitted to said wireless device of said IM client during a prior wireless connection" and "updating said second IM contact data associated with said IM client with said first IM contact data associated with said IM client for subsequent comparison". Support for the above additional recitation is provided at page 6, lines 26 through 29, of the specification. Thus, the second IM contact data, transmitted during a prior wireless connection, (i.e., the previous data) is updated with the first IM contact data (i.e., the current data) for subsequent comparison.

Serial No. 09/886,346  
Amdt. dated March 2, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of December 2, 2004

Attorney Docket No. PF02258NA

In contrast, the Heath, et al. patent discloses "summarising by sections the version of the file held at the user's computer and sending the file summary (compressed to a fraction of the actual file) to the server. At the server the received file summary is compared to the (updated) source file to determined the differences therebetween, and the server then transmits back to the user's computer the unencoded portions of the source file which are not found in the version of the file existing on the user's computer." Although the Heath, et al. patent describes an updated source file (i.e., the current data), the Heath, et al. patent does not describe or suggest any updating of the received file summary representing the file version at the user's computer (i.e., the previous data), for subsequent comparison or otherwise. Thus, the Heath, et al. patent does not describe or suggest updating the second IM contact data, transmitted during a prior wireless connection, (i.e., the previous data) with the first IM contact data (i.e., the current data) for subsequent comparison, as required by claims 1 and 12. Likewise, the Tsou, et al. publication and the Birkler, et al. publication do not describe or suggest any type of comparison, let alone updating one IM contact data of an IM client with another IM contact data of the IM client for subsequent comparison, as required by claims 1 and 12. Therefore, claims 1 and 12 distinguish patentably from the Tsou, et al. publication, the Heath, et al. patent, the Birkler, et al. publication, and any combination of these references.

Claims 2 through 11 and 13 through 21 depend from and include all limitations of independent claims 1 and 12 as amended. Therefore, claims 2 through 11 and 13 through 21 distinguish patentably from the Tsou, et al. publication, the Heath, et al. patent, the Birkler, et al.

Serial No. 09/886,346  
Amdt. dated March 2, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of December 2, 2004

Attorney Docket No. PF02258NA

publication, and any combination of these references for the reasons stated above for independent claims 1 and 12.

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of claims 1 through 21 are respectfully requested.

### CONCLUSION

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. Also, no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to deduct any additional fees arising as a result of this response, including any fees for Extensions of Time, or any other communication from or to credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2117.

It is submitted that the claims clearly define the invention, are supported by the specification and drawings, and are in a condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Should the Examiner have any


Serial No. 09/886,346  
Amdt. dated March 2, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of December 2, 2004

Attorney Docket No. PF02258NA

questions or concerns that may expedite prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,  
Smith, Dwight Randall, et al.

Please forward all correspondence to:  
Motorola, Inc.  
Law Department (HDW)  
600 North US Highway 45, AS437  
Libertyville, IL 60048

 03/02/05  
Hisashi D. Watanabe Date  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 37,465  
Telephone: (847) 523-2322  
Facsimile: (847) 523-2350